DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 585 UD 024 096

TITLE Communities in Crisis: Real Unemployment in America. A First Friday Report.
PUB DATE 2 Nov 84
NOTE 22p.
AVAILABLE FROM Full Employment Action Council, 815 16th St., N.W., Washington, DC 20006.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Employment; *Employment Problems; Federal Legislation; Females; Hispanic Americans; Labor Force Nonparticipants; Metropolitan Areas; One Parent Family; Statistics; Underemployment; *Unemployment; Urban Problems; Youth Employment

ABSTRACT

In October 1984, unacceptably high levels of unemployment persisted in many regions of the United States. Figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal that nearly 8.5 million Americans, or 7.4 percent of the civilian labor force, are still without work. When the 5.5 million Americans working part-time because of economic reasons, as well as "discouraged workers," the long-term unemployed, are included, the real rate of Americans affected by unemployment is 13.1 percent (compared to an official rate of 7.5 percent, or real rate of 12 percent, in October 1980). Within communities (national, state, or local), certain demographic groups continue to suffer from greater unemployment levels than other Americans. The unemployment rate for Blacks is 15.4 percent; for Hispanics, 10.9 percent; for youth, 18.8 percent; and for female heads of households, 10.5 percent. (Unemployment characteristics for these groups are profiled and current legislative proposals to address the nation's unemployment crisis are summarized. Three statistical tables show unemployment figures for the 20 largest cities, and unemployment rates by State.) (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A FIRST FRIDAY REPORT

Communities In Crisis: Real Unemployment In America

ED254585

November 2, 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ellen Vollinger
Full Employment Action Council

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Issued by the Full Employment Action Council in conjunction with:

Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union
Americans for Democratic Action
Center for Community Change
Children's Defense Fund
Coalition on Block Grants and Human Needs
Communications Workers of America
Food and Allied Service Trades Department, AFL-CIO
Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO
International Union of Operating Engineers
Lutheran Council U.S.A.
Office for Governmental Affairs
National Conference of Catholic Charities
National Council of La Raza
National Office for Black Catholics
National Urban League
NETWORK
Presbyterian Church U.S.A. Washington Office
Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project
Rural Coalition
Service Employees International Union
United Auto Workers
United Food and Commercial Workers
United Methodist Church Department of
Social and Economic Justice
General Board of Church and Society
United States Catholic Conference
United States Student Association
United Steelworkers of America
Wider Opportunities for Women

ID024096

BEST COPY

COMMUNITIES IN CRISIS:
REAL UNEMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA

Today, America's unemployment crisis continues. In October 1984, unacceptable, high levels of unemployment persisted in many regions of the United States. Several important demographic groups--blacks, Hispanics, youth and female heads of households--continued to suffer from unemployment rates far higher than the national average. The most recent state and metropolitan unemployment data available also portray a widening division among communities in the nation.

Unemployment figures for October 1984 released by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics on November 2, 1984, reveal that nearly 8.5 million Americans, or 7.4 percent of the civilian labor force, are still without work. When the 5.5 million Americans working part-time because of economic reasons, as well as "discouraged workers," the long-term unemployed, are included, the real rate of Americans affected by unemployment is actually 13.1 percent.[1] These figures compare with an official rate of 7.5 percent, or real rate of 12 percent in October 1980. Four years ago, or today, such figures are far higher than the overall 4 percent goal set for the country in the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Act of 1978.

---

[1] The real rate is calculated by adding to the offical unemployed, the official figures for discouraged workers and persons who, because of economic conditions, are working part-time but still seek full-time jobs. The total thereby raises the total percentage of Americans affected by unemployment.

The most recent metropolitan and state unemployment data released by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics on October 16, 1984 for August 1984, also show that many communities suffer from unemployment levels which are much higher than the national average might otherwise suggest.

The 20 metropolitan areas with the highest official unemployment rates for August 1984,[2] along with the estimated real rates for such areas, are as follows:

---

2 Metropolitan areas in Michigan, which otherwise might be included are not indicated because no official statistics are yet available for August 1984.

TABLE 1

TWENTY HIGHEST METROPOLITAN UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS (%)

	Location	August 1980 Official Rate	August 1980 Real Rate	August 1984 (Most Recent) Official Rate	August 1984 (Most Recent) Real Rate
1.	McAllen-Pharr-Edinburg, TX	NA	-	19.9	35.8
2.	Laredo, TX	NA	-	15.3	27.5
3.	Johnstown, PA	NA	-	14.1	25.4
4.	Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	NA	-	14.0	25.2
5.	Lake Charles, LA	5.8	9.3	13.2	23.8
6.	Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, IN	13.0	20.8	12.9	23.2
7.	Huntington-Ashland, WV	9.3	14.9	12.8	23.0
8.	Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito,TX	NA	-	12.7	22.9
9.	Sharon, PA	NA	-	12.5	22.5
10.	Duluth-Superior, MN	8.3	13.3	12.4	22.3
11.	Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, N.J.	8.9	14.2	12.3	22.1
11.	Youngstown-Warren, OH	12.8	20.5	12.3	22.1
12.	Northeast, Pennsylvania	9.6	15.4	12.1	21.8
13.	Pittsburgh, PA	7.7	12.3	12.0	21.6
14.	Kankakee, IL	NA	-	11.8	21.2
15.	Parkersburg, WV-Marietta, OH	9.5	15.2	11.4	20.5
16.	Modesto, CA	10.5	16.8	11.3	20.3
17.	Williamsport, PA	14.2	22.7	10.8	19.4
18.	Altoona, PA	9.8	15.7	10.6	19.1
19.	Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange, TX	7.4	11.8	10.3	18.5
20.	Tuscaloosa, AL	9.1	14.6	10.2	18.4

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
October 14, 1980 and October 16, 1984
Multiplier to determine real unemployment rate is 1.6 for 1980 and 1.8 for 1984.

Seventeen out of the 20 metropolitan areas with the highest official unemployment rates for August 1984 were substantially worse off than they were in August 1980, four years before. In two of the three remaining cities (i.e., Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, IN), the real rate for August 1984 was higher than the August 1980 figure.[3] Proportionately, the so-called "phantom unemployed" (i.e., discouraged workers and persons working part-time because of economic reasons) also have increased in the past four years.

A widening division between communities is also seen among the largest population areas of the country. Of the nation's 20 largest metropolitan areas, five have reported unemployment rates which are higher than the national average.[4] While nine metropolitan areas have

---

[3] Nationally, the real unemployment rate in August 1984 was 1.8 times higher than the official rate. In August 1980, the ratio was only 1.6 due to a smaller proportion of discouraged and part-time workers. Multipliers of 1.6 and 1.8 are used for calculating local real unemployment rates for August of 1980 and 1984 respectively. The application of these nationally-derived multipliers on local data actually results in a conservative estimate of local real unemployment. Areas of relatively high official unemployment also contain a higher proportion of discouraged and part-time workers.

[4] Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles-Long Beach, New York, and Pittsburgh.

unemployment levels which have decreased since 1980,[5] an equal number also face unemployment situations which have worsened.[6]

---

[5] Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Dallas-Forth Worth, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Phoenix, St. Louis, San Diego, and San Francisco.

[6] Chicago, Cleveland, Houston, Los Angeles-Long Beach, Miami, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Seattle-Everett.

TABLE 2

LARGEST TWENTY METROPOLITAN AREAS
UNEMPLOYMENT RATES (%)

	Location	August 1980 Official Rate	August 1980 Real Rate	August 1984 (Most Recent) Official Rate	August 1984 (Most Recent) Real Rate
1.	New York, N.Y.	9.1	14.5	9.2	16.6
2.	Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	7.0	11.2	8.7	15.7
3.	Chicago, IL	8.0	12.8	8.1	14.6
4.	Philadelphia, PA	7.1	11.4	7.5	13.5
5.	Detroit, MI	12.7	20.3	NA	-
6.	San Francisco-Oakland, CA	6.2	9.9	6.0	10.8
7.	Washington, D.C.	4.0	6.4	4.0	7.2
8.	Boston, MA	5.3	8.5	4.3	7.7
9.	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	5.2	8.3	3.5	6.3
10.	Houston, TX	4.5	7.2	6.1	11.0
11.	St. Louis, MO	8.5	13.6	7.4	13.3
12.	Pittsburgh, PA	7.7	12.3	12.0	21.6
13.	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	4.6	7.4	4.5	8.1
14.	Baltimore, MD	7.4	11.8	6.2	11.2
15.	Cleveland, OH	8.1	13.0	9.0	16.2
16.	San Diego, CA	7.6	12.2	5.9	10.6
17.	Atlanta, GA	6.4	10.3	4.8	8.6
18.	Miami, FL	5.9	9.4	7.1	12.8
19.	Phoenix, AZ	6.6	10.6	3.3	5.9
20.	Seattle-Everett, WA	6.3	10.1	6.8	12.2

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
October 14, 1980 and October 16, 1984
Multiplier to determine real unemployment rate is 1.6 for 1980 and 1.8 for 1984.

The unemployment picture is expected to be even worse in many rural areas, which are not included in official survey samples, and where many jobs are not covered by unemployment insurance, which provides the base for official statistics.

State-wide unemployment rates for August 1984 mirror the pattern established by figures for the 20 largest metropolitan areas. A growing division exists within the United States. Certain areas of the country may be marginally better off since 1980, but others are worse off. Of the 15 states, plus the District of Columbia, with unemployment rates higher than the national average, all but two (Michigan and Oregon) suffered from higher unemployment in August 1984 than in August 1980.[7]

---

[7] Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, D.C., Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Washington, and West Virginia. Seven states have official unemployment rates which are lower than the national average, but which are still higher than August 1980: California, Hawaii, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Oklahoma, and Wyoming.

TABLE 3

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

State	August 1980		August 1984 (Most Recent)	
	Official Rate	Real Rate	Official Rate	Real Rate
Alabama	10.3	16.5	10.9	19.6
Alaska	7.8	12.5	8.5	15.3
Arizona	7.6	12.2	4.5	8.1
Arkansas	7.9	12.6	8.3	15.0
California	7.3	11.7	7.5	13.5
Colorado	5.7	9.1	4.7	8.5
Connecticut	6.1	9.8	4.2	7.6
Delaware	7.8	12.5	5.6	10.1
District of Columbia	6.7	10.7	8.6	15.5
Florida	6.3	10.1	6.2	11.2
Georgia	7.0	11.2	5.9	10.6
Hawaii	5.5	8.8	6.1	10.9
Idaho	8.0	12.8	6.6	11.9
Illinois	8.4	13.4	8.6	15.5
Indiana	10.5	16.8	7.3	13.1
Iowa	7.1	11.4	5.9	10.6
Kansas	4.7	7.5	5.1	9.2
Kentucky	8.2	13.1	8.7	15.7
Louisiana	5.9	9.4	9.3	16.7
Maine	7.4	11.8	5.1	9.2
Maryland	6.2	9.9	5.2	9.4
Massachusetts	6.0	9.6	4.7	8.5
Michigan	12.5	20.0	10.3	18.5
Minnesota	5.4	8.6	5.6	10.1
Mississippi	7.4	11.8	11.1	20.0
Missouri	7.5	12.0	6.4	11.5
Montana	5.3	8.5	7.0	12.6
Nebraska	3.7	5.9	3.4	6.1
Nevada	6.3	10.1	7.6	13.7
New Hampshire	4.2	6.7	3.0	5.4
New Jersey	7.0	11.2	6.1	10.9
New Mexico	7.6	12.2	7.3	13.1
New York	7.7	12.3	7.5	13.5
North Carolina	7.0	11.2	6.1	10.9
North Dakota	4.8	7.7	4.0	7.2
Ohio	9.1	14.6	9.2	16.6
Oklahoma	4.2	6.7	6.7	12.1
Oregon	8.5	13.6	8.0	14.4
Pennsylvania	8.1	13.0	9.6	17.3
Rhode Island	7.3	11.7	5.0	9.0
South Carolina	6.8	10.9	6.6	11.9
South Dakota	4.8	7.7	3.5	6.3

(Continued on next page.)

TABLE 3
(Continued)

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

State	August 1980		August 1984 (Most Recent)	
	Official Rate	Real Rate	Official Rate	Real Rate
Tennessee	7.5	12.0	8.8	15.8
Texas	5.8	9.3	5.6	10.1
Utah	5.9	9.4	5.8	10.4
Vermont	6.4	10.2	4.1	7.3
Virginia	5.4	8.6	4.4	7.9
Washington	7.6	12.2	8.2	14.8
West Virginia	9.7	15.5	13.6	24.5
Wisconsin	6.8	10.9	6.7	12.1
Wyoming	3.3	5.3	4.9	8.8

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
October 14, 1980 and October 16, 1984
Multiplier to determine real unemployment rate is 1.6 for 1980 and 1.8 for 1984.

Within communities--national, state or local--certain demographic groups also continue to suffer from greater unemployment levels than other Americans. The national figures for October 1984 reveal the following rates:

- Blacks, 15.4 percent, compared to 15.2 percent in October 1980.
- Hispanics, 10.9 percent, compared to 10.6 percent in October 1980.
- Youth, 18.8 percent, compared to 18.4 percent in October 1980.
- Female heads of households, 10.5 percent, compared to 10.2 percent in October 1980.

The remainder of this report profiles unemployment characteristics for such groups, as well as summarizing current legislative proposals to address the nation's unemployment crisis. The following figures also highlight additional, disturbing realities behind the official October 1984 statistics:

- With 19.067 million people employed in manufacturing, there were nearly 472,000 fewer factory workers than in October 1980, when manufacturing jobs totaled 20.139 million.
- With 5.479 million people working part time for economic reasons, there are more than 1.2 million people in this category than four years ago in October 1980, when 4.261 million were counted.
- As of October 1984, the jobless rate included an additional 1.2 million discouraged workers who have given up looking for work and are not even counted among the officially unemployed.

- While young people represent more than 17 percent of the unemployed, there has been a net job loss among teenagers of 75,000 since the recession bottomed out in December 1982.

- The annualized unemployment rate in the nation's official metropolitan poverty areas actually increased from 17.2 percent to 18.1 percent between 1982 and 1983, while the unemployment rate in non-poverty areas declined from 9.1 percent to 8.6 percent during the same period.

- With an unemployment rate of 49.2 percent and 351,000 jobless black teens, there were about the same number of black 16-to-19 year olds unemployed as in October 1980, when the rate was 39.7 percent and 353,000 were counted as officially unemployed.

- Female headed households continue to experience higher than average unemployment with a rate of 10.5 percent as 629,000 are without jobs. Their unemployment status was far better in October 1980 when 543,000 were jobless with an unemployment rate of 10.2 percent.

- The average period of unemployment was 13.2 weeks in October 1980. In October 1984 it was 16.5 weeks.

- In 1983 a total of 23.8 million people were unemployed sometime during the year, representing nearly 20 percent of the labor force. The proportion of blacks and Hispanics who were jobless at some point during the year was 29.1 percent and 24.3 percent, respectively.

- Only 30 percent of the unemployed were drawing unemployment insurance benefits--close to the smallest proportion in the nearly 50 years of unemployment legislation.

- As of March 1984, there were 5.7 million children with at least one officially unemployed parent. Over 7.8 million children had no parent who was employed.

A review of the record since October 1980, shows that 3.8 million workers were added to the unemployment rolls between then and December 1982, the low point of the recession. The job gains since

then total about 6.5 million--but the number unemployed has shrunk by only 3.5 million, as the labor force expanded in the same period. In other words, unemployment as of October 1984, was still 426,000 higher than in October 1980, and the rate of 7.4 percent is higher than in <u>every</u> year between 1947 and 1981 except for the recession year of 1976.

The Unemployment Crisis for Blacks

The unemployment rates for black workers continue to run about double those for white workers. The size of the gaps has not been appreciably affected by decreases in the overall unemployment figures. Moreover, blacks constitute a disproportionate number of those who have given up looking for jobs--those "discouraged" workers whose numbers are not counted in the overall national average. And, blacks are two to three times as likely to be long-term jobless as are white workers.

- In October 1984, 15.4 percent of black workers were unemployed. That month, 1.872 million black Americans were looking for work but could not find it.
- Joblessness among black teenagers was at depression levels in October, with BLS reporting a black teen unemployment rate of 40.2 percent.
- Blacks, who constitute only 11 percent of the aged 16-to-65 population, represent nearly 33 percent of the "discouraged workers", according to BLS data for the second quarter 1984.
- According to BLS, during the second quarter, 379,000 black Americans who wanted to work had given up looking for a job because they did not think they could find one.
- A BLS Monthly Labor Review report on long-term unemployment (February 1984) found that blacks are two to three times as likely to be long-term jobless as are whites. Researchers attribute the problem of long duration unemployment for blacks to their higher probability of becoming unemployed in the first place.
- Blacks are two to three times as likely to be poor as whites.
- One in two black children are poor.

--Prepared by Full Employment Action Council

The Unemployment Crisis for Hispanics

The Hispanic community is the youngest and fastest growing group in the nation. In 1980, Hispanics constituted 6.4 percent (14.6 million) of the total population in the U.S. The Census Bureau estimates that there were about 15.9 million Hispanics in March 1983. Studies estimate that the Hispanic population might increase to 47 million by the year 2020--becoming the second largest minority group in the nation. The youthfulness of this population group presents serious policy implications in the areas of education and employment. Hispanics suffer from the lowest educational attainment rate of any group in the nation and also have high rates of underemployment and unemployment. Policy makers will have to ensure that the educational system and the labor market meet the needs of the Hispanic community.

- In October 1984, the official Hispanic unemployment rate was 10.9 percent. That month, 689,000 Hispanic workers were looking for jobs but could not find them.
- The Hispanic youth unemployment rate for the second quarter 1984 was officially 24.2 percent.
- Hispanics are projected to account for at least 9 percent of the labor force by 1995.
- Hispanics account for 6 percent of the total population, but in 1982, Hispanics made up 12.5 percent of the country's poor.
- Regional areas of high concentration of Hispanics witnessed severe unemployment rates. In El Paso, Texas, the 1983 annual unemployment rate was 12.3 percent. In Starr County, located in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas and the poorest county in the U.S., the 1983 annual unemployment rate was 40.5 percent.

(Continued on page 15.)

- Hispanic women are the lowest paid workers in the labor force--on average Hispanic women earn 51.4 cents to every dollar earned by white men.
- Similarly, on average, Hispanic men earn only 71.2 cents to every dollar by white males.

--Prepared by The National Council of La Raza

The Unemployment Crisis for Youth

The 1983-84 economic upturn from the deepest and most severe recession since the Great Depression of the 1930's has brought few benefits to our nation's young people. While teens continue to represent nearly 17 percent of the unemployed, they have been receiving fewer than 3 percent of all new jobs. For minority youth, the situation is worse. The annualized labor force participation rate for black teens in 1983 declined to the lowest level ever. Alarming numbers of young people are moving into adulthood without ever having worked.

- As of October 1984, the official unemployment rate for youth was 18.8 percent.
- The number of employed teens fell by 54,000 since last month.
- The unemployment rate of black teenagers dropped to 40.2 percent, while the white teen rate dropped slightly from 16.6 percent to 16.1, but maintaining a substantial gap between the two groups.
- Only 24.4 percent of black and 35.9 percent of Hispanic teenagers are employed, compared to 47.4 percent of white teenagers.
- Nearly 1.1 million 16-24 year olds who are currently looking for work have never worked before.
- On average during 1983, 1.55 million teens classified as outside of the labor force expressed a desire to be employed on a part-time or full-time basis.
- The teenage population declined by 8.3 percent between 1979 and 1983. The number of employed teens, however, fell by 21.5 percent.
- The 1983 annualized labor force participation rates of black and Puerto Rican teenagers were the lowest is history, 36.4 and 27.1 percent compared to 56.9 percent for whites.
- Fewer than 10 of every 100 black teenagers have full time jobs.
- The unemployment rate of 1983 black high school graduates (37.5 percent) substantially exceeds that of white high school dropouts (23.5 percent).

--Prepared by The Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project

The Unemployment Crisis for Female Headed Families

The number of female headed families has increased dramatically from 5.6 million in 1970, to 8.5 million in 1980, to 9.9 million in 1984--an increase of over 75 percent. Female headed families accounted for 16 percent of all families in the U.S. in 1984, compared to 11 percent in 1970. Studies have concluded that women who maintain families are more likely to be impoverished, unemployed, underemployed and underpaid than other kinds of families or individuals, despite their desire to participate in the work force.

- As of October 1984, the official unemployment rate for female headed families was 10.5 percent.
- One in six single mothers in the labor force is unemployed. More than one in four single mothers with children under age three is unemployed.
- More than one in three female headed families is poor. Among blacks and Hispanics, more than one in two female headed families is poor.
- More than half the children in female headed families are poor. More than two-thirds of the black and Hispanic children in these families are poor.

--Prepared by Wider Opportunities for Women

Emergency Legislation Is Needed To Create Jobs For The Unemployed

With more than 15 million men and women unemployed, working part-time or entirely out of the job market because of discouragement, there is a terrible urgency for Congress to enact legislation that will create jobs, equip individuals with marketable skills, and assist jobless workers. There are several proposed programs that could help in this effort.

COMMUNITY RENEWAL EMPLOYMENT ACT

A meaningful jobs program is vitally needed, both to provide work for those who would remain unemployed under even the most optimistic of the Administration's economic predictions and to accomplish tasks essential to communities.

The Community Renewal Employment Act, H.R. 1036, will provide important assistance to those citizens hit hardest by the recession. The bill is targeted to long-term jobless workers in areas of high unemployment. To ensure that the work created is productive, the bill specifies activities such as repair of public facilities, conservation of public lands, and provision of day care, health and other community services. Fully 20 percent of the funds are set aside for repair work in education facilities, particularly to detect and remove asbestos in schools. To ensure that monies go out in a timely fashion, the bill permits no more than 105 days between appropriating funds and filling jobs. Moreover, to guard against abuse or substitution, H.R. 1036 requires the Employment Service to certify participants and triggers an automatic investigation where the regular workforce declines more than five percent. Finally, to make H.R. 1036 a jobs bill in fact as well as in name, the bill stipulates that at least 75 percent of the funds go for wages.

H.R. 1036 makes economic sense. Initial outlays will begin to be offset immediately by reductions in federal payments to the jobless, especially food stamps and welfare, to which UI exhaustees increasingly must turn. Moreover, starting in 1984 and extending through 1985, federal revenues will increase through the taxes paid by these productively employed workers.

YOUTH INCENTIVE EMPLOYMENT ACT

The Hawkins-Kennedy Youth Incentive Employment Act (H.R. 5017, S. 2397) would authorize $2 billion to provide full-time employment during the summer months and part-time employment during the school year to economically disadvantaged youth. These youth must agree to maintain performance standards at the worksite and agree to remain in or return to school. H.R. 5017 is modeled after a 30-month demonstration project mandated by Congress in 1977. Researchers have documented positive results, including dramatic increases in the labor force participation rates of black teenagers. Those involved in employing youths also have praised the pilot program approach. H.R. 5017 would provide funds to service delivery areas under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Eligible youth would work in public agencies, private non-profit organizations, and private for-profit employers. Approximately one million low-income teenagers would be served under the program.

The Administration-backed subminimum wage plan is misguided economic policy and bad social policy. In contrast to H.R. 5017, the proposal to pay teenagers a subminimum wage ignores the factors that are responsible for the high rate of unemployment among

teenagers, penalizes disadvantaged persons who struggle to make ends meet even at the current minimum wage, and sets a dangerous precedent by violating the principle of equal pay for equal work. Young people need adequate employment and training and the opportunity to contribute to society. They neither desire nor deserve lower wages for the work they do.

AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Legislation to create an American Conservation Corps (ACC) to provide about 100,000 jobs for unemployed young people in conservation and related projects has passed the House of Representatives in 1982 and again in 1983. A more limited youth conservation bill is pending in the Senate. Two other youth jobs programs — the Youth Conservation Corps established in 1970 and the Youth Adult Conservation Corps created in 1977 — were terminated by the Reagan Administration. Proponents of the youth conservation approach, such as the Youth Policy Institute (YPI), argue that the programs are cost-effective. YPI notes that in 1979 there was a $1.10 return for each dollar spent on the youth conservation jobs program.

In the absence of authorization for a federal program, several state and local governments have established their own youth conservation jobs programs. If ACC is enacted, eligible projects would include forest and soil conservation, urban revitalization, historic preservation, road and trail development, erosion control, and production of renewable energy resources.

Plant Closing Legislation

The Issue

- In 1982, at least 600 entire plants and production facilities were permanently shut down, resulting in over 200,000 lost jobs.
- In the last three years, some three million manufacturing jobs have been lost, many to plant closings.
- Industries particularly hard hit by plant closings include steel, autos, glass, rubber, clothing and textiles, paper, metal fabrication, machine tools, and electronics, among others.
- Less than 20% of plant closings involve bankruptcy or financial insolvency, and about one-third of plants closed are less than six years old.
- Most plant closings occur with little or no advance notice or assistance to affected workers and communities.

National Employment Priorities Act

- Requires companies to give workers and communities up to one year advance notice of an intended plant closing.
- Directs the Secretary of Labor to undertake a comprehensive investigation of an intended plant closing.
- Provides assistance to affected workers through job training, job placement, job search, job relocation and education expenses.
- Provides assistance to distressed businesses through loans, loan guarantees, interest subsidies, technical aid and targeted federal procurement.
- Provides assistance to affected local governments through grants, loans, loan guarantees and other economic development assistance, and requires companies to pay up to one year in local taxes.
- Requires companies that close a plant to provide affected workers with extended health care and other benefits, job transfer rights, and up to 52 weeks or $25,000 in severance pay.

Action Needed

- Members of the House should be asked to support and cosponsor the National Employment Priorities Act (H.R. 2847).

Distributed by: Full Employment Action Council
815 16th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
202/393-7415